

Neg Attack

Advantage one: Right to subsistence

1) No reason to change the current policy.

As we argued in the negative constructive speech, the idea of social security financed by social insurance money is the “habit of the heart” for Japanese people. The affirmative team failed to prove why we have to do away all of these work-oriented social security programs completely.

2) The current social security can better cope with the problem.

We are much better off maintaining the present policy with some minor adjustment. For instance, we can relax the requirement for membership so that even irregular workers will be able to obtain the entitlement for social insurance.

Takashi Suganuma, Professor of social policy at Rikkyo University, 2014

Insecurity of irregular workers is the main issue in the labor market in contemporary Japan. Although some advocate BI as the fundamental solution to rescue excluded workers, BI is not feasible to relieve them immediately. This requires an implementation of a lengthy phasing-in process. It is likely to face political resistance and requires many legal changes. Therefore, it is much easier to adjust the existing Bismarckian insurance to the contemporary situation by relaxing the requirement for memberships. Inclusive social insurance is more realistic than BI. (location 1286)

(Transforming Japan’s Bismarckian welfare state: Basic income versus inclusive social insurance *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state*. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)

Professor Suganuma continues:

The main aim is to cover all irregular workers under social insurance programs if they are employed for more than one hour. Therefore, even irregular workers working only an hour a week should be able to obtain membership of social insurance programs. With such a rule, employers cannot avoid paying contributions while they employ irregular workers. Irregular workers would thus be able to remain as members of workers’ social insurance. (location 1269)

(Transforming Japan’s Bismarckian welfare state: Basic income versus inclusive social insurance *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state*. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed)

3) No solvency.

The affirmative never realizes the right to subsistence. Thanks to BI, companies and employers can reduce worker's pay. This will aggravate their life in destitution.

Professor Henning at University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, 2014

First, if we consider the social inequalities which would remain after an UBI is introduced, ascending from people not working up to people in highly paid jobs and owners of capital, it is a remarkable consequence that the people who would be „bound to lose“ the most are ordinary workers. Where does this tendency result from? It has to be considered that Van Parijs (1995: 108) expects the level of UBI to be the higher, the higher the level of involuntary unemployment. This assumption is unusual, since common sense would assume that the pool for benefits dries up when many people claim benefits. Van Parijs assumes the contrary: given high rates of unemployment, more people would want to work, so the price paid for the “asset” of having a job would increase. The simple reason for this is the law of demand and supply: the higher demand, the higher the price, in this case the price for occupying a job. And so, in Van Parijs' view of society, people opting out of work in a period of high unemployment would receive a higher UBI (that sounds good), but only because workers would earn less and pay more. They would earn less because high unemployment reduces wages, and they would have to pay more since the “asset” of having a job would cost them higher UBI-taxes. Since Van Parijs seems cautious not to tax capital too much, this policy would protect capital and burden labour twice. This is a high price for a warm glow. (113) (Christoph Henning, Philosophy Department, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland. He has published widely on economic philosophy, Marxism, and critical theory, and recently wrote a book entitled Political Philosophy of Perfectionism.) “Does Basic Income Have to Justify Capitalism?: A Critique of Philippe Van Parijs' View of Society” *Homo Oeconomicus* 31(1/2): 109-124 •(2014))

Advantage two: Alternative lifestyle.

1) No reason to change the current social security policy.

Apply the arguments I made above. Workfare can allow us to pursue diverse lifestyles, with the minimum financial support such as public assistance. We proved that the current policy could provide more inclusive social insurance. Affirmative must prove why it cannot.

2) No solvency.

Under the affirmative, BI recipients who do not work will never enjoy their lifestyles. It is because the Japanese social norms stigmatize them.

Professor Suganuma, 2014

In theory, tax-financed social benefits do not always stigmatize recipients. However, the Japanese tend to prefer social insurance to a tax-based system owing to the following four main reasons. First, social insurance can help to avoid stigma because of its contributory principle. In Japan, tax-financed benefits are believed to induce stigma. Traditionally, tax-based benefits have been targeted, selective, and narrowly restricted to specific low-income groups. Based on the Japanese social policy tradition, the risk-sharing nature of social insurance is seen as the best tool for ex-ante poverty prevention compared to tax-financed social assistance as ex-post poverty relief.

(location 1121)

(Transforming Japan's Bismarckian welfare state: Basic income versus inclusive social insurance *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state*. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)

3) Again, no solvency.

Under the affirmative, no humanistic and cultural development is possible. It is because work is central to the self-conception and well-being of humans.

Rie Takamatsu, Assistant professor of human sciences at Osaka University & Toshiaki Tachibanaki, Professor of economics at Doshisha University, 2014

Marxists do not support it as they are on the side of the working population. The quote, "If you do not work, you shall not eat," has formed the basis of Marxist philosophy for a long time. Therefore, BI advocates should wonder how to convince Marxists to agree with a policy scheme that pays surfers who do not work. (location 4286)

(What needs to be considered when introducing a new welfare system: Who supports basic income in Japan? *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a*

radical idea in a transforming welfare state. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed)